

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

CYNTHIA GRAMBERG,

Plaintiff,

V.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 24-12998-BEM

ORDER

MURPHY, J.

January 30, 2025

On November 25, 2024, the Clerk of this Court received an envelope addressed to the “Senior Judge” of this Court. Inside the envelope were “Notices” signed by Cynthia Gramberg titled “Special Notice For All Public Officials: Deportation Is Illegal,” “Law Enforcement Do Have To Protect and Serve All Inhabitants,” “Capital Punishment Is Unlawful Slavery,” “Defective Amendments Subverting Law In the Constitution For The U.S.A.,” “Stop The Corruption In The United States[] Supreme Court,” and “The Union Was Never Broken.” ECF No. 1. In these documents, Gramberg sets forth the historical basis and rationale for each of her broad assertions. Gramberg does not indicate that that she intends to commence a lawsuit, but the papers were administratively treated as a complaint and put on the docket of this Court as a new case. On January 8, 2025, the Clerk received eight additional “Notices” from Gramberg concerning rights of corporations, deportation, rights of homeless persons, rights of states, the Constitution, duties of law enforcement, and capital punishment. ECF Nos. 8-11.

The Court orders that this matter be CLOSED for lack of jurisdiction. Article III of the Constitution limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to “Cases” and “Controversies.” U.S. Const.

art. III, § 2. A “Case” or “Controversy” exists when a plaintiff can demonstrate “(i) that she has suffered or likely will suffer an injury in fact, (ii) that the injury likely was caused or will be caused by the defendant, and (iii) that the injury likely would be redressed by the requested judicial relief.” *Food & Drug Admin. v. All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 602 U.S. 367, 380 (2024). The federal courts cannot “operate as an open forum for citizens ‘to press general complaints about the way in which government goes about its business.’” *Id.* at 379 (quoting *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 760 (1984)). They also cannot “issue advisory opinions about the law—even when requested by the President.” *Id.* at 378-79.

Gramberg’s submissions do not set forth a “Case” or “Controversy” as the terms are used in Article III. Her papers are more akin to a treatise or a political critique. Without calling into question the value of Gramberg’s writings, the Court cannot take any action on them. Accordingly, the action shall be CLOSED for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Brian E. Murphy
United States District Judge